1FW/AF

PTO/SB/21 (08-08)
Approved for use through 09/30/2008. OMB 0651-0031

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number.

TRANSMITTAL FORM

(to be used for all correspondence after initial filing)

Total Number of Pages in This Submission

Application Number 10/697,084-Conf. #9737

Filing Date October 31, 2003

First Named Inventor Tatsuhiko Tanimura

Art Unit 3714

Examiner Name M. J. Thomasson

Attorney Docket Number SHO-0051

ENCLOSURES (Check all that apply) After Allowance Communication Fee Transmittal Form Drawing(s) to TC Appeal Communication to Board of Fee Attached Licensing-related Papers Appeals and Interferences Appeal Communication to TC Amendment/Reply Petition (Reply Brief) Petition to Convert to a Proprietary Information After Final Provisional Application Power of Attorney, Revocation Affidavits/declaration(s) Status Letter Change of Correspondence Address Other Enclosure(s) (please **Extension of Time Request** Terminal Disclaimer Identify below): Return Receipt Postcard **Express Abandonment Request** Request for Refund Information Disclosure Statement CD, Number of CD(s) Certified Copy of Priority Landscape Table on CD Document(s) Reply to Missing Parts/ Remarks Incomplete Application Reply to Missing Parts under 37 CFR 1.52 or 1.53 S/GNATURE OF APPLICANT, ATTORNEY, OR AGENT Firm Name FISHMAN & GRAUER PLLC Signature Printed name Carl Schaukowitch Reg. No. Date September 9, 2008 29,211

SEP 0 9 2008

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re the Application of:

Tatsuhiko TANIMURA et al.

Application No.: 10/697,084

Filed: October 31, 2003

For: GAMING MACHINE

Attorney Docket No.: SHO-0051

Examiner: M. J. Thomasson

Art Unit: 3714

Confirmation No.: 9737

REPLY BRIEF

MS APPEAL BRIEF - PATENTS

Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dear Sir:

In response to the Examiner's Answer dated July 9, 2008, Applicants hereby respond as follows:

The rejection of the claims under 35 USC §103(a) rejection is predicated on three configurations taught in the prior art:

- 1. In Fig. 2 of Ozaki (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2001/0031658), transparent EL panels 28a, 28b and 28c + openings 27a, 27b and 27c on the intermediate panel 27;
- 2. In Fig. 28 of Ozaki, LCD panel 24 + semi-transparent reflective plate 25; and
- 3. In Satoh (U.S. Patent No. 6,811,273), opening 10d through the transparent frame member 10.

It is respectfully submitted that a skilled person would NOT be motivated to provide an opening 27a,b,c (Fig. 2) on the semi-transparent reflective plate 25 (Fig. 28) of the second configuration with LCD panel 24 (Fig. 28). Accordingly, a person of ordinary skill in the art would NOT be motivated to combine the second configuration with the first or the third configuration. The Examiner summarily maintains the §103 rejection by asserting that Satoh discloses the transparent frame member 10 (Fig. 1) being formed with an opening 10.

Application No.: 10/697,084

The Examiner admits that Ozaki fails to disclose any cutouts or recess formed in the light guiding plate in the configuration shown in Fig. 28, which is an embodiment using an LCD panel 24, while pointing out that the cutouts are disclosed in the configuration shown in Fig. 2 of Ozaki, which is another embodiment using an EL panel 28a, b, c. As clearly described in paragraph [0045] of Ozaki, the intermediate panel 27 shown in Fig. 2 is opaque. Thus, cutouts are formed on the intermediate panel 27 so that the reels 30 could be seen through the opaque intermediate panel 27 and through the transparent EL panel 28a, b, c. An EL panel is a spontaneous luminescent type device that does not require backlight for displaying an image.

In the alternative embodiment shown in Fig. 28 of Ozaki, the semi-transparent reflective plate 25 is disposed in order to provide a backlight to the LCD panel 24. A skilled person would not be motivated to form a cutout, like the one formed on the opaque intermediate panel 27, on the semi-transparent reflective plate 25 that is already <u>semi-transparent</u> as shown by the arrows in Fig. 28.

A skilled person would also not be motivated to do so by a reason that, if a cutout is formed on the semi-transparent reflective plate 25, the backlight would not be provided to the LCD panel at the cutout when the back side display device 2 is made dark as described in paragraph [0139], causing damage to the image displayed by the LCD panel.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that a skilled person would not be motivated to form a cutout on the semi-transparent reflective plate 25 as such disclosed in a different embodiment of Ozaki or in Satoh. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the claimed invention would not be obvious from the combination of Ozaki and Satoh.

The above arguments apply to each one of the independent claims 1, 2, 4 and 10.

It is respectfully submitted that the Examiner had failed to establish a *prima* facie case of obviousness for the reasons set forth above either under the TSM (teaching suggestion motivation) test or the factual inquiries under <u>Graham v. John</u>

Application No.: 10/697,084

<u>Deere Co.</u> as discussed above and in detail in the Appeal Brief filed on April 22, 2008. It is respectfully requested the Board overturn the rejection and allow the pending claims.

Respectfully automitted,

Dated: September 9, 2008

By: Carl Schaukowitch

Reg. No. 29,211

RADER, FISHMAN & GRAUER PLLC

1233 20th Street, N.W. Suite 501 Washington, D.C. 20036 Tel: (202) 955-3750 Fax: (202) 955-3751

Enclosure(s):

Customer No. 23353

Transmittal of Reply Brief

DC325979.DOC